

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TRACY EUGENE JONES,) Case No. 1:21-cv-01207-SAB (PC)
Plaintiff,)
v.) ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST TO
HENRY C. AGUWA, et al.,) FILE A REPLY TO DEFENDANTS' ANSWER
Defendants.) (ECF No. 24)
)

Plaintiff Tracy Eugene Jones is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Currently before the Court is Plaintiff's request to file a reply to Defendants' answer, filed February 14, 2022.

As stated in the Court's January 24, 2022 order, neither the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure nor the Local Rules provide for the right to file a reply to an answer. (ECF No. 23.) “[A]n additional pleading by the plaintiff may be helpful to the defendant in laying the groundwork for a motion to test the sufficiency of the claim or defense.” 5 Charles A. Wright & Arthur R. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure § 1185 (3d ed.2004). When a leave to file a reply is requested by the party who will submit the pleading, there must exist “substantial reason” for the request. Beckstrom v. Coastwise Line, 13 F.R.D. 480, 482 (D. Alaska 1953).

///

///

Here, the Court does not file that a reply to the answer is necessary, and Plaintiff has not demonstrated a substantial reason why leave should be granted to file the reply. Accordingly, Plaintiff's request to file a reply to Defendants' answer is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **February 16, 2022**



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE